

ADDITIONS AND CORRECTIONS
IN
THE SEVENTH EDITION
OF
THE BOOK OF GENESIS

BY
S. R. DRIVER, D.D.

METHUEN & CO.
36 ESSEX STREET W.C.
LONDON
1909



ADDITIONS AND CORRECTIONS
IN
THE SEVENTH EDITION
OF
THE BOOK OF GENESIS

BY
S. R. DRIVER, D.D.

METHUEN & CO.
36 ESSEX STREET W.C.
LONDON
1909

1

NOTE.

THE seventh edition of my *Book of Genesis* does not differ in any substantial respect from the preceding ones; I have only been obliged to make some alterations, due to the advance of knowledge, in certain matters relating to chronology and archaeology. In consequence of the discovery in 1907 of a cuneiform Chronicle shewing that the Second Babylonian dynasty was in part contemporary with the First, the date of the First dynasty, and with it that of its sixth king, Hammurabi, have had to be lowered; and I have now, throughout the volume, altered the date of Hammurabi to B.C. 2130—2088. It seems also now that the astronomer Mahler's date for Ramses II., B.C. 1348—1281, which has been adopted by Professor Sayce, rests upon mistaken data, and that he must be placed, with Petrie, Meyer, and Breasted, c. 1300—1234 B.C.: the probable date of the Exodus becomes thus c. 1230 B.C. I have revised the Chronological Table (opposite p. i of the Introduction), in accordance with the latest and best authorities; and I have inserted two notes in the *Addenda*, intended to help readers to understand the difficulties of early Egyptian and Babylonian chronology, and to explain to them the reasons for the divergent dates that have been proposed for the early periods of Egyptian and Babylonian history. Some fresh notes on other subjects have also been introduced into the *Addenda*. It occurred to me that, among those who possessed an earlier edition of the work, there might be some who would be glad to be able to obtain these additions and corrections without being under the necessity of purchasing the seventh edition itself; and they are accordingly collected separately in the present form.

S. R. D.

August 2, 1909.

CORRECTIONS.

P. xxix, ll. 1—2, read: ‘with our present knowledge, the most probable date for Hammurabi’s reign is b.c. 2130—2088’: see the *Addenda*, pp. xxix—xxxI. Abraham’s date in l. 4 thus becomes c. 2100 b.c.

Lower down in the page, for ‘but Sayce’s date,’ &c. read: ‘but Petrie, Breasted and Meyer agree in assigning to Ramses II. dates varying only from b.c. 1310—1244 to b.c. 1292—1225’: thus, according to the best available authorities, the Exodus will have taken place between c. 1240 and c. 1220 b.c.

Footnote 1 is cancelled: for n. 2 substitute:—

Professor Sayce’s date for Ramses II., b.c. 1348—1281 (*Mon.* 230, 242), quoted here in previous editions, is that fixed by the astronomer Mahler in 1890: but though it is true that a ‘Sothic’ period (see the *Addenda*, pp. xvii—xviii) began in b.c. 1318, it seems that Mahler was mistaken in supposing that a certain horoscope in the roof of the Ramesseum at Thebes connected the beginning of this period with Ramses’ 30th year (Eisenlohr, *PSBA.* 1895, p. 282; Meyer, *Aeg. Chronol.*, 1904, p. 38). The date 1348—1281 for Ramses II., and with it Prof. Sayce’s date for the Exodus, b.c. 1277, consequently fall through altogether.

P. xxx, ll. 5—9, read: ‘All that we can say is that, if the Israelites were 430 years in Egypt, and the Exodus took place c. 1230 b.c., the Pharaoh of Joseph will have been one of the Hyksos kings, who ruled (Petrie) b.c. 2098—1587, or (Meyer and Breasted) b.c. 1680—1580’: see the *Addenda*, p. xix.

P. xxxii, n. 2. On the other hand, Thureau-Dangin is of opinion that this high date for Sargon cannot be maintained (*Journal des Sarants*, 1908, p. 201), and Meyer even brings him down to b.c. 2500. Pending further discoveries, it seems thus that the question of Sargon’s date must be left an open one.

P. xxxiii, l. 10, for ‘by Brugsch,’ &c. read: ‘by Meyer and Breasted to c. b.c. 3400²; and in l. 16 read: ‘beginning b.c. 3998 (Petrie) or b.c. 2900 (Meyer).’ Brugsch’s provisional chronology, which is followed by Budge, does not do justice to the *data* now known, and is antiquated. From the accession of the 18th Dynasty, the rival chronologies vary only by a few years (see the Table, p. xlvi): for the earlier period, with our present knowledge, our choice must lie between the chronology of Petrie as given in his *History* (Menes, b.c. 4777), of Meyer and Breasted (Menes, c. b.c. 3400), and of Petrie as given in his *Researches in Sinai*, 1906 (Menes, b.c. 5510).

² In explanation of these divergences, see the *Addenda*, pp. xvii—xix.

P. xxxiii, ll. 21—28, read: ‘brought to light remains of a “pre-dynastic” period (i.e. of a period preceding Menes), extending at least 7—800 years before Menes, in which the inhabitants of the Nile Valley, though they had

not yet developed the arts practised in the early "dynastic" period⁵, displayed a marvellous skill in fashioning flint into weapons, tools, and implements of all kinds ;'

⁵ See the careful comparison of pre-dynastic and early dynastic civilization in Egypt, as illustrated by objects found in tombs, with a summary of results, in G. A. Reisner's *The Early Dynastic Cemeteries of Naga-ed-Dér* (in the University of California Publications), Leipzig, 1908, pp. 126—135. The earliest tombs at present explored are dated by Reisner 7—800 years before Menes (Meyer's date). Copper implements first appear in the middle of the pre-dynastic period (pp. 114—7).

P. xxxiv. On remains of the palaeolithic age in Egypt, see King and Hall, *Egypt and Western Asia in the Light of Recent Discoveries* (1907), pp. 5—14.

P. xlvi, last line but one, and p. xlix, ll. 1—3, for 'On.....and in other contract-tablets' read: 'In other contract-tablets' (omitting n. 1); and for n. 2 substitute:—

¹ A name of the same form as Ishmael, 'May God hear !' Jerahmeel, 'May God be compassionate!' &c.: cf. pp. 182, 295. The statement made here in former editions, on the authority of Hommel (*AHT.* 74 n., 96 n.), Sayce (*EHH.* 13—14, 38, 128), and Pinches (p. 148), that the name *Abé-ramu* (= 'Abram') appears on a contract-tablet of the Hammurabi-age, was incorrect: the name was misread by Hommel; and it is really *Abi-eraḥ*: see A. H. Clay, *Light on the OT. from Babel* (Philadelphia, 1907), p. 142; Ranke, *Personennamen*, p. 58. In Pinches³ (1908), p. 148, the comparison is withdrawn. At a much later date, however, *Abu-ramu* (= 'Abram') does occur as the name of the Assyrian official who gave his name to the 5th year of Esarhaddon (B.C. 677): see *KAT.*² p. 479.

P. li, l. 10: omit 'and Sayce'; and for Budge's date substitute 'Meyer and Breasted, 1501—1447.'

P. 27, n. 1. Add a reference to Gressmann's *Altorientalische Texte und Bilder zum AT.* (1909), i. 4 ff.

P. 34, n. 2, ll. 2—3, substitute:—

'The contract-tablets seem to shew that in the Hammurabi-age (p. 156) there was a marked abstention of work on these days in Babylonia: see the *Addenda*, p. xxiv.'

P. 52, n. 5, ll. 4—5, read: 'Its oracle is alluded to by Eriaku [p. 156]: see the *Addenda*, p. xxxii.'

P. 90, vii. 11, the note on *the second month* now reads: '*the second month*. I.e., probably (Gunkel, pp. 133, 134; König, *ZDMG.* 1906, p. 628), the second month of the year according to which P always reckons, and which began with Abib (Ex. xii. 2, compared with xiii. 4), = our April. In the Babylonian story, the flood, according to Berossus, began on the 15th of Daisios (= June).'

P. 106, l. 9, read: '1984—1964' for '2245—2228'; and p. 107, l. 4, '1980' for '2200.'

P. 120, l. 7 from bottom: for '2400' read '2232—2219.'

P. 121, end of note on *Niniveh*, read: 'at present [1909] known, who is styled "king," is Ilu-shumma, c. 2200 B.C.': see the *Addenda*, p. xxix, n. 1.

P. 128, note on *Elam*, ll. 4 to end, substitute: 'This people early developed a flourishing and many-sided civilization: at a remote period (? 3800 B.C.),—though not before they had invented a system of writing,—they were subjugated by Sargon of Agadè; and the early Elamite princes (many of whose

names have recently been recovered) style themselves *patesi's* ("priest-kings," or "viceroys"), shewing that they were dependent upon Babylonia. Assurbanipal tells us that an Elamite king, Kudur-nanchundi, 1635 years before himself (= B.C. 2280), invaded Babylonia, and pillaged many temples; and not long after we find Elamite rulers firmly established in S. Babylonia, till their power was broken by Hammurabi (below, p. 156 f.) and his successor Samsuiluna (B.C. 2087—2050)¹. In later times Elam is mentioned repeatedly both in the Ass. inscriptions and in the OT. (ch. xiv. 1; Is. xi. 11, xxi. 2, xxii. 6; Ez. xxxii. 24, *al.*). Racially, the Elamites were entirely distinct from the Semites, their language, for instance, being agglutinative and belonging to a different family: their geographical proximity to Assyria is no doubt the reason why they are here included among the "sons" of Shem.'

¹ See Scheil, *Textes Élamites-Sémitiques* (1900), pp. ix.—xii.; or the account of M. de Morgan's excavations in 1897—1899, by St Chad Boscawen, in the *Asiatic Quarterly Review*, Oct. 1901, p. 330 ff.; King in King and Hall's *Egypt and Western Asia in the Light of Recent Discoveries* (1907), pp. 221—229, 229—233 (on the 'Proto-Elamite' system of writing), 234—246; Meyer, *Gesch. d. Altertums*², I. ii. (1909), pp. 408—410, 541—544, 551—556, 557 f., 563 top.

P. 128, end of note on *Arpachshad*. Prof. Sayce offers another conjectural explanation of the same name in the *Exp. Times*, Feb. 1907, p. 232.

P. 137, l. 15, for 'almost contiguous to' read: '8 or 9 miles from.' When the former words were written, the only plan of ancient Babylon available was the one put forth by Oppert, largely upon a conjectural basis, in about 1850, and reproduced in Smith's *DB.* and elsewhere; but recent excavations have shewn that the ancient city did not by any means extend as far in the direction of Borsippa as Oppert supposed.

P. 137, ll. 23—4, for 'is generally considered...Birs Nimroud' read: 'was discovered in 1906, in the course of the excavations organized by the German Orient-Gesellschaft, under the mound of 'Amrān'; and for *n.* 3 substitute:—

² See Weissbach, *Das Stadtbild von Babylon* (1904), p. 21, and the plan, p. 13; or Langdon's art. on the topography of ancient Babylon in the *Expositor*, July, 1909. For a view of Birs Nimroud, see Smith, *DB.* i. 159 (²i. 320). The mound of 'Amrān is marked on the map *ibid.* i. 153 (²i. 317), or in *EncB.* i. 415—6; but the plan of the city in Smith (reproduced from Oppert), representing it as a large quadrangle, is completely antiquated.

P. 156, ll. 5—7, for 'Hammurabi...2334' read: 'Hammurabi reigned for 43 years²,—according to Thureau-Dangin and Ungnad, B.C. 2130—2088³'

² See the nearly contemporary chronological register of part of this dynasty, first published by L. W. King, in his *Letters and Inscriptions of Hammurabi*, III. (translations), 1900, pp. lvi.—lxxi., 212—253: cf. Pinches, *OT. in the light of the records &c.* 211 ff.

³ The date B.C. depends in part upon statements made by later kings: as these are not in all cases perfectly consistent, other scholars arrive at somewhat different dates for Hammurabi, as 2198—2155 (Poebel, *Z. für Ass.* 1908, p. 175), or 1958—1916 (Ed. Meyer, *Gesch. des Altertums*², I. ii., 1909, p. 341). But all earlier dates, such as those given formerly by Sayce, Johns, and others, have become antiquated since the publication in 1907 of the newer material contained in L. W. King's *Chronicles concerning early Babylonian Kings*: see the *Addenda*, pp. xxviii—xxxI.

For *n.* 1 substitute:—

‘For a list of the 11 kings of this dynasty, see the *Addenda*, p. xxix.’

Cancel the present *n.* 3; and for *n.* 5 substitute:—

⁴ See particulars of his reign in Maspero, II. 39—44, or the Introd. to King, *Letters*. He constructed among other things a system of canals in Babylonia. In 1901, also, a very interesting code of laws promulgated by him, was discovered, containing remarkable parallels to several of the civil and criminal laws found in Ex. xxi.—xxiii., Lev. xx., and Deut. xii.—xxvi.: see Johns, *DB.* v. 584—612; and S. A. Cook, *The Laws of Moses and the Code of Hammurabi* (1903).

Cancel *nn.* 6 and 7, and in the first line of paragraph 2 read: ‘Eriagu or Eriaku⁵’, with the footnote:—

⁵ Eriagu, or Eriaku, is the Sumerian equivalent of the Semitic ‘Arad-sin,’ the name by which this king is usually known. The old identification with *Rim-sin*,—which depended on the doubtful assumption that this name could be read *Eriaku*,—is now given up. See further particulars in the *Addenda*, pp. xxxi—xxxii.

P. 167, l. 7 from bottom, for ‘seven’ read: ‘six.’ The letters numbered 182, 185 in Winckler’s edition have been found to form really one letter (182^a + 185 + 182^b): see Knudzton’s *El-Amarna Tafeln*, 1908, No. 289. Note 3 is corrected accordingly.

P. 194, note on *v.* 14, l. 3, for ‘2 S. i. 20’ read: ‘2 S. i. 26.’

P. 221, add to footnote:—

‘Bones of infants, which had been presumably sacrificed, buried in jars, have been found at Gezer, Taanach, and Megiddo: see the writer’s “Schweich Lectures” for 1908, on *Modern Research and the Bible* (1909), pp. 68 f., 82, 84; S. A. Cook, *Religion of Ancient Palestine* (1908), p. 36 f.’

P. 229, l. 14, read: ‘B.C. 1300—1234’ (Petrie’s more recent date for Ramses II.).

P. 229, *n.* 2, l. 3, add:—

‘more probably, B.C. 2130—2088; see the *Addenda*, pp. xxix—xxx.’

P. 267, *n.* 4, add:—

‘see the writer’s *Schweich Lectures*, pp. 62—65, 84 (with illustrations).’

P. 337, note on *v.* 7, l. 3, for ‘with them’ read: ‘with him.’

P. 347, l. 26, for ‘1348—1281, Sayce’ read: ‘1300—1234, Petrie.’

P. 347, l. 34, for ‘1750 B.C., Brugsch and Budge,’ read: ‘1580, Meyer and Breasted,’ with a footnote, ‘After a rule, however, of only 100 years,—see the *Addenda*, p. xix.’

P. 409, *n.* 2, add:—

‘and G. F. Moore in the *American Journal of Theology*, 1908, p. 34 ff.’

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2008 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

ADDENDA.

P. xxviii. The attempt which is sometimes made to harmonize the Biblical narrative with an earlier date for the first appearance of man than B.C. 4157, by denying that the genealogy in Gen. v. supplies any basis for a chronology, does patent violence to the terms used. Had indeed the language of Gen. v. been simply that *A* begat *B*, and *B* begat *C*, &c., it might have been conceivable, as in Mt. i., that links were omitted: but when *the age of each patriarch at the birth of his first-born* is expressly stated, such a supposition is manifestly out of the question.

P. xxix n. The date c. 1300—1234 for Ramses II is supported by the fact that, if Thothmes III is rightly assigned to B.C. 1501—1447, the known regnal years of the intervening kings require an interval of at least $26 + 8 + 36 + 25 + 34 + 2 + 21 = 152$ years between them (Breasted, *Hist. of Egypt*, 1906, p. 599).

P. xxxiii. Egyptian chronology rests upon four principal bases: (1) the list of 31 dynasties, with the numbers, and, in most cases, the names of the kings in each, and the years which they reigned, drawn up by Manetho, a priest of Sebennytus, c. 280 B.C. The Egyptian history of Manetho has perished: but his list is quoted by Africanus, Eusebius, and (in part) by Josephus. (2) Native lists,—all either partial, or, unhappily, mutilated,—the principal of which are the Turin papyrus, the Tablets of Abydos, Sakkāra, and Karnak, and the Palermo Stone, first published in 1906¹. (3) The highest years of kings mentioned in the inscriptions. These notices are naturally not of a character to yield a complete chronology: but they yield *minimum* dates for the reigns of many kings, and often supply us with the means of checking or correcting other statements. (4) Astronomical occurrences assigned in the inscriptions to the reigns of particular kings, the dates of which can be determined by astronomical calculation. The Egyptian calendar year consisted of 365 days; and began on 1 Thoth (properly, our July 19), the day on which the dog-star, Sirius or Sothis, rose with the sun in the morning. But the year thus annually marked by the rising of Sothis with the sun is virtually

¹ See a synopsis of Manetho's list, as quoted by different ancient writers, and of the first three of the native lists mentioned, in Sayce's *Egypt of the Hebrews* (1902), pp. 287 ff. The Palermo Stone dates from the 5th dynasty, and is of importance as shewing how carefully, even at this early date, the annals of every king had been kept, probably from the time of Menes. For an account, and translation, of the inscription, see Breasted's *Ancient Records of Egypt* (Chicago, 1906), i. 51 ff.

identical with the astronomical year of (approximately) 365½ days: hence in the Egyptian calendar year a quarter of a day was dropped every year; every four years, therefore, the calendar reached the end of the year, and began the next year, one day too soon, so that the new year began a day before the one on which Sirius rose with the sun; and as this process continued, the calendar new year, and with it the calendar months of the Egyptian year, all began earlier and earlier, till after 1460 years they had shifted back an entire year, and all began a year too soon. The rising of Sothis with the sun coincided with 1 Thoth, the calendar New Year's Day, in b.c. 4241/0—4238/7, 2781/0—2778/7, 1321/0—1318/7: if, therefore, we found a statement that the 'heliacal' rising of Sothis took place in a given year (say) 30 days later than 1 Thoth, we should know, in virtue of what has been said, that that year was $30 \times 4 = 120$ years after one of these dates b.c.

From the 18th dynasty onwards there is little difference in the dates arrived at by different modern Egyptologists, two fixed points, consistent with each other, being capable of determination by astronomical calculation¹. (1) A papyrus states that in the 9th year of Amen-hôtep I, the 2nd king of this dynasty, Sothis rose with the sun on the 9th of Epiphi, i.e. 308 days after 1 Thoth: $4 \times 308 = 1232$; the 9th year of Amen-hôtep I was thus 1232 years after 2781/0—2778/7, or (taking the earliest of these alternatives) was 1549 b.c., and his first year was 1557 b.c. (2) In a document dating from the reign of Thothmes III, the festival of the heliacal rising of Sirius is said to have taken place on the 28th of Epiphi, i.e. 19 days later than in 1550/49—1547/6. As $4 \times 19 = 76$, the year referred to will have been 76 years later than 1550/49—1547/6, or 1474/3—1471/0. One of the years 1474/3—1471/0 fell consequently during the reign of Thothmes III, which by means of notices respecting the appearance of the new moon is fixed more closely to b.c. 1501—1447. This date for Thothmes III will make the 18th dynasty begin c. 1587 b.c.

Manetho's reporters give confused and discrepant accounts of the statements respecting the five dynasties preceding the 18th: but according to Josephus he stated that for 511 years before the 18th dynasty, Egypt was ruled by the foreign invaders called the *Hyksos*: these (Petrie²) were partly contemporary with native Egyptian dynasties, and they were preceded by the 453 years of the 13th dynasty: thus Petrie makes the 12th dynasty end b.c. 2565, and (adding the 213 years assigned to it by the Turin papyrus) begin b.c. 2778. But a document (one of the Kahun papyri) discovered in 1899 contains a statement that in the 7th year of Usertesen³ III of this dynasty, the festival of the heliacal rising of Sothis fell on the 15th of Pharnuthi, or 225 days after 1 Thoth: $4 \times 225 = 900$; the 7th year of Usertesen was consequently 900 years after b.c. 2781/0—2778/7, or b.c. 1881; his first year was thus 1887 b.c.; and the dynasty ruled (adding, before and after Usertesen, the regnal years known) b.c. 2000—1788. It follows from this

¹ Comp., with what follows on this subject, Breasted, *Ancient Records of Egypt*, i. 25—48 (with a table of dynasties, and dates of reigns), 221—3.

² *History of Egypt*, ii⁵ (1903), p. 204 f.

³ Or, as the name is now read (Meyer, p. 245), *Senwosret* (the prototype of 'Sesostris').

lower date for the 12th dynasty, that, if it be correct, Manetho's 511 years for the Hyksos must be far too great; accordingly those who accept it allow for the whole of the 13th to the 17th dynasties only about 200 years (B.C. 1788—1580), and for the Hyksos only c. 1680—1580.

Such is the explanation of the great divergence between Petrie on the one hand, and Meyer and Breasted on the other, as regards the date of the 12th dynasty. The cogency of the astronomical argument is admitted by Petrie: the correctness of the Sirius *datum* in the 12th dynasty is, he points out, confirmed by two independent testimonies from monuments in Sinai (*Researches in Sinai*, 1906, pp. 168—170): but Meyer and Breasted's reduction of the length of the 13th to the 17th dynasties, he argues, does great violence to the combined testimony of Manetho and the Turin papyrus, Manetho assigning to this whole period 1590 years, and the Turin papyrus so far supporting him that it gives the names of 100 or more kings belonging to the 13th and 14th dynasties (*ibid.* 171—6). Petrie accordingly now (p. 175) has recourse to the other possible alternative of reckoning Usertesen's 7th year as 900 years, not from the Sothic period which began 2781 B.C., but from the *previous* Sothic period which began (see above) 4241 B.C. He thus gives now (*l.c.*) as the date of the 12th dynasty B.C. 3459—3246, and as the date of Menes B.C. 5510. Against such a high date Meyer and Breasted argue that Manetho's figures are not trustworthy. The sixty kings of the 13th dynasty had only short reigns, the early Hyksos were partly contemporary even with the 13th dynasty, and the sparsity of monuments belonging to the 13th—17th dynasties is unfavourable to the supposition that the period was such a long one (see Meyer, *Aeg. Chron.* 60—65, *Nachträge*, 31—39, *Gesch. d. Alt.²* I. ii. 276—286, 293). The future must shew which of these three divergent chronologies will ultimately be found to accord best with the available *data*.

For the purposes of the present note, it is not necessary to pursue the subject of Egyptian Chronology further: those who desire fuller information may be referred to Petrie, *Hist. of Egypt*, i.⁵ (1903), 145—7, 200—5 (on the Hyksos period), 248—254 (the date of Merenptah, p. 251, modified in iii. p. 2), ii. 25—34 (for p. 32, comp. Meyer, *Nachträge*, p. 43f.; and on the other side, Petrie, *Sinai*, pp. 177—181), iii. pp. vi—viii; Budge, *Hist. of Eg.* (1902), i. 111—161; Ed. Meyer's masterly treatise *Aegyptische Chronologie* in the *Abhandlungen* of the Berlin Academy, 1904, with the *Nachträge*, *ibid.*, 1907; Breasted's invaluable *Ancient Records of Egypt, Historical Documents from the earliest times to the Persian conquest, collected, edited, and translated with Commentary* (5 vols.; Chicago, 1906), i. 25—48, 221—3; Petrie, *Researches in Sinai* (1906), pp. 163—181; Meyer, *Gesch. des Altertums²*, I. ii. (1909), pp. 28—38, cf. 53—56, 95—102, 276—286, 293; more briefly, Breasted, *Hist. of Egypt* (1906), pp. 13 f., 21—23, with Table of Dynasties, pp. 597 ff.

Pp. xlvi n. 2, 24 n. 2 (second paragraph). I rejoice to see substantially the same criticisms made independently by the Rev. G. S. Streatfeild on pp. 15—17 of his pamphlet cited below (p. lxvii).

P. xlix. On the supposed occurrence of the name *Yahweh* in Babylonian, the most recent discussion in English is in Rogers' *Relig. of Bab. and Ass., especially in its relations to Israel* (New York, 1908), pp. 89 ff., who agrees

that it does so occur. Other Assyriologists, however, still question this: see Daiches, in the *Z. für Ass.* 1908, pp. 125 ff. Zimmern, at least in 1903 (*KAT*³ 468 n.), regarded it as very uncertain.

P. xl ix n. 2. It is interesting to find, in the list of places in Palestine taken by Shishak (c. B.C. 930), one (No. 71—2), which is considered now by Egyptologists to correspond to a Semitic *חַקְלָאָבָרָם*, 'Field of Abram' (*ḥākal* being an Aramaic word, the one found in '*Akel-dama*' = *הַמָּאָקֶלֶת*, and also occurring eight times besides in the same list): see Breasted, in *Amer. Journ. of Sem. Lang.* xxi. (1904), p. 36, *Hist. of Eg.*, p. 530; and cf. Spiegelberg, *Aegypt. Randglossen zum AT*, 1904, p. 14, and Meyer, *Die Israeliten und ihre Nachbarstämme*, 1906, p. 266. If the critical view of the dates of the Pentateuchal sources is correct, this will be the earliest occurrence of the name Abram: the site of 'Abram's Field,' it may be reasonably presumed, was at or near Hebron (cf. below, on xiii. 18).

Pp. xl ix—l. See further, on the true bearings of archaeology on the O.T., the excellent and lucid article of Stanley A. Cook in the *Expositor*, June, 1906, esp. pp. 529 ff., 534 ff., where it is shewn, among other things, that the idea, still current in some quarters, that archaeology has overthrown many of the conclusions of literary and historical criticism, is based simply upon a misconception of the facts. Similarly, Prof. A. S. Peake, in an instructive and discriminating lecture on 'The Present Movement of Biblical Science' (published in *Inaugural Lectures by Members of the Faculty of Theology of Manchester University*, 1905, edited by A. S. Peake), p. 31, after referring to the many services rendered to Biblical science by archaeology, says, 'But while archaeology has done all this, it remains true that, so far as Old Testament scholarship is concerned, it has not confirmed a single position doubted by sober criticism.' To the same effect, also, with many pertinent illustrations, Prof. W. H. Bennett, in an article on 'Archaeology and Criticism' in the *Contemporary Review* for April, 1906, pp. 518 ff.

P. lii. Whether the Egyptian name quoted really contains the name 'Joseph,' experts appear to be more and more doubtful (Spiegelberg, *Randglossen*, p. 13 n.; cf. Meyer, *op. cit.* p. 292): W. M. Müller now adopts as its Semitic equivalent *Yashub'-el* (see *Journ. of Bibl. Lit.* 1909, p. 31; and cf. *EncB.* ii. 2582, n. 1 end).

P. lvi, footnote. Readers of the Dean of Canterbury's *The Bible and Modern Investigation*, should be aware that Dillmann's views are seriously misrepresented in it. The Dean, namely, seeks to shew there (pp. 30—47) that Dillmann, the man of 'strong sense and historical capacity' (p. 33), arrived at far more conservative conclusions with regard to the historical character of the Pentateuch than Prof. G. A. Smith and myself had done. But the Dean has misread Dillmann. So far as Genesis is concerned, Dillmann does not 'accept the historical truth' of the patriarchal narratives (p. 42), in the sense in which any ordinary reader would understand the expression. It is true, he argues against the opinion that these narratives rest upon *no* foundation in fact; but the historical substratum which he finds in them is almost entirely *tribal*, the actual *personal* element which he recognizes in them is very small: not only Lot and Ishmael, but also Isaac and his descendants are the personi-

fications of tribes¹: in Abraham there is an indeterminate personal element, but most of the details about him are due either to popular '*Sage*,' or to the narrators. Thus the details, even of such a chapter as Gen. xxiii. (P), are the 'free composition of the narrator' (*Genesis*, p. 296); J in particular contains numerous examples of the free expansion or development of a traditional nucleus; and the many conversations in his narratives ('e.g. Gen. xviii.—xix., xxiv., xliii.—xliv., and elsewhere') can be only regarded as peculiarly his own work². Dillmann's *Theologie des AT.s*, published posthumously, represents probably to some extent an earlier stage of his conclusions on the subject; but even here (p. 77) his view is that the traditions about the patriarchs, which were 'first written down in the post-Mosaic and prophetic age,' have been 'greatly transformed and idealized under the influence of the Mosaic and prophetic religion, that in particular tribal history has been largely recast into family history, and that it is now for us very difficult, and in fact impossible, to distinguish the actual facts from the ideal truth which has been put into them.' None of the conclusions thus reached by Dillmann can be said with any truth to be more conservative than mine (pp. xliv—lvii, lv—lix); and the opinion that any of the principal patriarchs represent tribes I have expressly rejected (p. lvii). See further a paper in the *Expository Times*, March, 1906, pp. 282 ff., where I have shewn further, by citation of Dillmann's actual words, that his views with regard to the sources of J, E, and Deuteronomy, the dates of J and E, and the historical character of the representations of P, &c., so far from being, as alleged, more conservative than mine, are, to all intents and purposes, the same.

P. 3, on i. 1. With a language as largely unknown in England as Hebrew is, it is possible for an amateur or theorist to perform extraordinary feats. Thus Mr Fenton, in a work called *The Bible in Modern English*, translates the first verse of Genesis in this way, 'By Periods God created that which produced the Solar Systems; then that which produced the earth.' To say nothing about the rest of this rendering, what, we may ask, would be thought of a Latin scholar who, having before him the words *In principio*, gravely informed his readers that *principium* was a plural word, and meant 'periods'? Yet this would be an exact parallel to what Mr Fenton has done. Other parts of the Old Testament are translated in the same fashion: thus Dt. xxxiii. 20 'Let the horseman (!), Gad, be blest!' and Daniel becomes (Daniel iv. 9) 'Chief of the Engineers' (!).

P. 24 n. 2 (cf. p. xlvi n. 2). It is extraordinary how anyone can seriously regard Mr Capron's book as containing a real solution of the problems raised by a comparison of the Bible with science. In confirmation of the position

¹ *Commentary on Genesis*, in the last ed. of 1892, p. 218 f. (cf. pp. 316, 403). In the English translation, vol. ii. p. 3 bottom, the sentence beginning with 'As' should read: 'As in the case of Lot, Ishmael, Esau, and their sons, it is sufficient to regard them [i.e. Isaac, and Jacob, p. 3 bottom] as ideal personal names, taken from particular groups within the limits of the nation, or from the whole at different stages of its development.'

² *Comm. on Num., Deut., Jos.* (in Dillmann's final discussion of the composition of the Hexateuch), p. 629.

taken in the two notes referred to, the Dean of Christ Church (Dr T. B. Strong) permits me to print the following, as it appears to me, eminently sound criticism:—‘It seems to me that there are serious and fundamental objections not only to details in Mr Capron’s book, but to the whole method of it. In the first place, it is plain upon the surface that Mr Capron has put upon the author of Genesis, whoever he was, a purpose which cannot have been before him. He is trying to extract from the book a scientific interpretation of the world in a modern sense. Now the scientific interpretation of the world in a modern sense is a comparatively late product, and may be said to have developed out of a condition in which the religious and scientific aspects of the world were fused. The writer of Genesis ascribes the origin and conduct of the world to God, and so far as that explains why the world came into existence it may be said to have the germ of the scientific explanation in it. But the scientific explanation strictly so called belongs to a later stage of the history of the human mind than the author of Genesis.

‘Secondly, Mr Capron hopes to find Genesis anticipating the form of philosophy in which he himself appears to believe, namely the philosophy of Herbert Spencer. Here he seems to me to be unconsciously doing the author of Genesis a serious wrong. The philosophy of Herbert Spencer is not infallible, and is already sharply criticized. Precisely therefore in proportion as Mr Capron has success in finding this philosophy in Genesis he involves Genesis in all the risks of refutation and modification which beset the Spencerian philosophy. If Genesis is shewn to speak in terms of Herbert Spencer, and Herbert Spencer should then prove unsatisfactory, he involves Genesis in his own collapse; and this is particularly unreasonable, as there is no clear evidence that the author wished to set forth Spencerianism.

‘Once more, the position can be maintained only by violent exegesis. No one could seriously maintain that the words e.g. of the Creation-story naturally have the meaning which Mr Capron puts upon them. In other words he starts with the interpretation he wants to extract from them, and forces them into harmony with it. This is a method which has been pursued before in the history of interpretation, but which is now completely discredited. It is in fact a modern form of the Alexandrine method of allegorical interpretation, such as we find in Philo Judaeus. In Philo’s day a prevalent philosophy, which he himself thought satisfactory, was a kind of syncretism, combining elements of Stoicism and Platonism. This philosophy Philo felt bound to extract somehow from the Pentateuch. He was applying to the Old Testament the method which the Greeks were applying to Homer. But though his application of his principle is highly ingenious, no one in the world supposes that it was successful. The whole of it disappears when it is recognized, as it must be, that the author did not mean that or anything like it. Mr Capron appears to be doing a similar thing in the interest of the philosophy of Spencer with a similar lack of success.’

P. 24 n. 3. Canon Bonney has reaffirmed recently, in greater detail, the opinion here expressed by him respecting the irreconcilability of Gen. i. with science, in an article in the *Church Family Newspaper*, Oct. 9, 1908, p. 862. Prof. Hull, in the article which Canon Bonney here criticizes, only reconciles

them by disregarding all the points in which they differ! Prof. Hull confines himself virtually to pointing out (what is, of course, perfectly true) that Genesis affirms, and nature exhibits, the realization of a divine plan in the development and structure of the physical universe; but that is something very different from proving that the *order of events*, as described in Genesis, and as taught by science, is the same.

P. 26. Dr McCosh, in his *Religious Aspect of Evolution*, pp. 93 ff., who has been recently brought forward as an 'authority' for the harmony of Genesis i. with geology, simply, as he himself expressly avows (p. 93), follows Guyot, Dana, and Dawson, especially Guyot, whose attempted reconciliations have been sufficiently dealt with on pp. 22—25 of the present volume. The correspondence exhibited by his table, pp. 96—98, is as illusory as that exhibited by Sir J. W. Dawson's Tables (below, p. 23 *note*), and contains the misstatements which in one form or another are inseparable from all such 'harmonies.' Thus science does *not* teach that 'there must have been light nourishing plants before the sun was condensed' (see, on the contrary, the quotation from Prof. Pritchard, below, p. 25 *note*), or that the moon was 'thrown off' from the earth *after* the appearance of vegetation upon it (on the contrary, when the moon was thrown off, the earth, or at least the outer envelope of it, must have been *molten*, 'twenty-seven miles in depth going to its [the moon's] formation': see Prof. Sollas, *The Age of the Earth*, p. 8); and Gen. i. 16, 17 speaks not of the sun, moon, and stars as 'becoming visible' on the Fourth Day, but, as plainly as language can do, of their being 'made' and 'set' in the heavens on that day (below, p. 25). And Romanes' remark, quoted on p. 99 from a review (*Nature*, Aug. 11, 1881, p. 334), that the order in which the flora and fauna are represented as appearing in Genesis agrees with the evidence of science, must have been made in forgetfulness of the facts; for it is contradicted by what is taught in every geological manual (Dana, Dawson, Geikie, &c.: see below, p. 22, &c., and the quotation from Prof. Bonney, p. 24, note 3). Professors Dana and Dawson, it should be remembered, are the only men of scientific eminence who have even attempted, during recent years, to harmonize Gen. i. with the teachings of science; and it is disingenuous to quote them as authorities for their agreement without at the same time acquainting the reader,—who certainly would not otherwise suspect what they were,—with the methods by which, respectively, the supposed 'reconciliation' was accomplished by them. The 'accuracy' which, in a passage that has been recently quoted, Sir J. W. Dawson extols in Genesis, is in reality non-existent; it is obtained, partly by ignoring or obscuring the facts which conflict with it, and partly by forcing upon the words of Genesis senses which they do not bear. Thus, in addition to what has been pointed out below (pp. 23, 25), Sir John Dawson understands the 'deep' of v. 2 not, as probably every other reader has always understood it, of an abyss of water, but non-naturally of a 'vaporous or aeriform mass' enveloping the earth, which ultimately became the atmosphere; and v. 3 is interpreted by him not of the first beginning of light, but of the intensification of previously existing light by the concentration of the luminous matter which emitted it, to form the

sun (*Origin of the World, &c.* pp. 105, 113, 120 f.). Surely, if Gen. i. were really accurate, it would bear its accuracy upon its face: it would not have to be wrung from it by means of exegetical *tours de force*, such as are unheard of in the interpretation of any other literature (cf. below, p. 24 (4), with *nn.^{2,3}*, and p. 25). Enlightened Roman Catholic scholars admit the truth candidly: see Père Lagrange, *Revue Bibl.* 1896, p. 381 ff. (on Gen. i.), esp. p. 388 f.; Minocchi, *La Genesi*, 1908, p. 22 ff.

Nor, it may be worth adding, is it correct to say, at least without material qualifications, that Gen. i. agrees with science in placing the creation of light before the formation of the sun. For according to Gen. i. light was created (*v. 3*) *after* water already existed upon the earth (*v. 2*): according to science, however, light was already given out by the luminous gaseous nebula,—if not, also, by many other nebulae as well,—which ultimately, after untold ages had passed, was condensed into the bodies forming the solar system. If, therefore, it is stated that Genesis agrees with science in placing the creation of light *before* the formation of the sun, truthfulness demands that it should be stated at the same time that it also *disagrees* with science in placing its creation *after* the formation of the earth, with water upon it; whereas in fact, according to science, light existed unnumbered ages before the primitive nebula could have condensed to form either the earth or water.

It will be understood that, as is pointed out at greater length below (pp. 26 ff.), this and other disagreements with science, though their existence ought not to be denied, in no way detract from the *religious* value of the cosmogony of Genesis, or obscure the clearness with which it gives expression to such *general* truths as those of an ordered sequence in the process of creation, and of stages moving upwards towards man.

A word may perhaps be permitted on the subject of ‘Evolution.’ Evolution may be true or false, or partially true and partially false: but in either case it is not taught in the first chapter of Genesis: the language used in this chapter does not suggest, whether directly or indirectly, either a transition from vegetable to animal life, or a transition from one species, whether vegetable or animal, to another. For a statement of what appears to him to be the right attitude for the theologian to adopt towards this principle of science, the writer may be permitted, perhaps, to refer to the first of his *Sermons on the OT.* (1892), on ‘Evolution compatible with Faith.’

P. 34 n. 2. Out of 356 tablets belonging to the period of the first Bab. dynasty, examined by Mr Johns, 5 are dated on the 7th day of the month, 5 on the 14th, 8 each on the 21st and the 28th, and only 2 on the 19th. As the average, after deducting 39 for the first day of the month, would be about 11, there seems thus to have been at this period in Babylonia a marked abstention from secular work on these five days, especially on the 19th. In the 8th and 7th centuries, on the contrary, out of 356 dated documents, 40 are dated on the first of the month, 12 on the 7th, 11 on the 14th, 16 on the 21st, 11 on the 28th, and only 2 on the 19th: in this period, the only day marked by such abstention was the 19th (Johns, *Exp. Times*, Sept. 1906, p. 567; cf. Dec. p. 141). In the neo-Babylonian period contracts appear to

have been signed as frequently on the 19th day of the month as on the other days (Schiaparelli, *Astronomy in the OT.* 1905, pp. 176—8, with statistics respecting 2764 tablets dating from b.c. 604—449). Out of 2554 tablets examined by R. D. Wilson (*Princeton Theol. Rev.* Apr. 1903, p. 246), and for which therefore the average would be 85, 54 are dated on the 7th of the month, 88 on the 14th, 180 on the 21st, 67 on the 28th, and only 8 on the 19th: but it is not stated to what period or periods these tablets belong.

P. 34 n. 3. In a recently discovered lexical tablet, the word *shapattu*, 'sabbath,' is used in explanation of the Sumerian *Ud-huia-kam* (the '15th day,' i.e. the day of the full moon): see Zimmern, *ZDMG.* 1904, pp. 199 ff. See a translation of the tablet in Pinches, *OT. in the light of the hist. records and legends of Ass. and Bab.*³ (1908), p. 527: it explains different expressions in which the word *Ud* ('day') occurs.

Both Zimmern (p. 201) and Pinches (p. 27 f.) are of opinion that though one of the characters is mutilated, *shapattu* occurs also in the fifth of the Creation-tablets. Line 14, viz., as given below (p. 29), is followed by five lines, of which the last four are addressed to the moon; and the fourth of these is read by Zimmern and Pinches as here rendered (the rest in Ugnad's translation, in Gressmann's *Texte u. Bilder zum AT.* 1909, i. 20):—

‘He exalted him monthly, without fail, in a tiara:
“At the beginning of the month shalt thou rise over the land,
With horns shalt thou shine, to determine six days:
On the seventh day, [shew thou] a half-tiara,
On the [sa]bbath thou shalt be equal [in both] halves.”’

‘Sabbath’ will here denote the 14th (or 15th) day of the month.

P. 51 ff. See further, on Gen. iii., the very full discussion in Tennant, *The Sources of the Doctrines of the Fall and Original Sin*, 1903 (including the history of these doctrines in later Jewish and Christian hands).

P. 52 n. 4. But see R. C. Thompson, as cited in the *Exp. Times*, Nov. 1903, p. 50 f., who contends that no sacred garden is here referred to at all.

P. 72. With the views respecting Cain here referred to, comp. Foakes-Jackson, *The Biblical History of the Hebrews* (1903), pp. 7, 363 f.

P. 106. The fact that the Babylonian narrative of the Flood exhibits agreements with *both* J and P has been used lately as an argument for impugning the critical conclusion that the Biblical narrative is composite. It is difficult to take this argument seriously. The critical view is (p. 107) that the story,—with of course such Babylonian features as were included in it,—was current in Palestine, that it was committed to writing in two slightly different forms, and that excerpts from the two texts thus produced were combined to form the existing Biblical narrative. If the Biblical narrative arose in this way, the marvel surely would be if both its component parts,—derived, as *ex hyp.* they both are, from a story containing Babylonian features,—did not exhibit resemblances with the Babylonian narrative.

P. 107 f. Süss's discussion of the Babylonian story of the Flood is accessible now to English readers in the English translation of his *Flood of the Earth* (1904), i. 20—40 (esp. pp. 30 ff.), 57, 63—65, 69, 71 f. See, however,

also the criticism of Sollas, *The Age of the Earth*, p. 316, who points out that in view of the now known elevation of the point at which the Zab enters the Assyrian plain above the sea,—some 600 ft.,—no recorded combination even of a cyclone with an earthquake could have driven a storm-wave even remotely as far; it would not have driven it up the Tigris even as far as Bagdad (154 ft. above the sea). If, therefore, this is the true explanation of the Babylonian Flood-story, there must, in so far as Hasisadra's ship is represented as grounding on Nişir, be considerable exaggeration of the facts.

P. 125. Interesting additions to our knowledge of the Hittites have been made lately by the excavations of Prof. Winckler in 1906—7 at Boghaz-keui, the old capital of the Hittites, in the modern province of Angora, the ancient Cappadocia. Here, in what seem to have been the archives of the ancient Hittite kings, an extensive collection of cuneiform inscriptions, expressed in partly the language of Babylonia, partly the native language of the country, has been discovered, giving much information about the history and political condition of the Hittites and neighbouring peoples, and also testifying to the brisk political correspondence carried on at this distant period between the Hittite kings and other nations, including even Egypt, in Babylonian. It is striking evidence of the wide-reaching influence of Babylonia in the ancient world, to find Cappadocia and Egypt corresponding in its language and script. Among other notable discoveries made at Boghaz-keui were portions of the Babylonian version of the famous treaty, concluded by Ramses II with the Hittites in his 21st year, c. 1280—1270 B.C., of which previously only the Egyptian text had been known. See the *Mitteilungen der Deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft*, No. 35 (Berlin, Dec. 1907).

P. 131, note on x. 29, l. 8. This identification, which was originally Lassen's, is suggested by the fact that 'al gum,' and the Heb. words for *ivory*, *apes*, and *peacocks*, are apparently Indian: see Max Müller, *Lectures on the Science of Language*, first series, ed. 1864, pp. 208 ff. (who accepts it). It is objected (Keane, *The Gold of Ophir*, 46 f.) that *Abhira* is not the name of a people, but means simply a region where the *Abhirs*, a widespread caste of 'cowherds,' were settled. Still Ptolemy mentions a district *Aberia* in precisely the same locality: and Josephus (*Ant.* viii. 6. 4) identified Σωφηρα [LXX. for 'Ophir' has in 1 K. ix. 28 Σωφηρα] with Chryse (i.e. Malacca), 'which belongs to India.'

P. 131 n. 4, on x. 29, Ophir. It should have been stated that Prof. Keane, though he identifies Ophir with Dhofār on the S. coast of Arabia, considers that the 'gold of Ophir' was found in Mashonaland, and only brought to 'Ophir' as an *emporium*. Dr Carl Peters discusses the question of Ophir at great length in his *Eldorado of the Ancients* (1902), pp. 289—369. Peters, however, distinguishes between the Ophir of Gen. x. 29 and the Ophir of Solomon, whence the gold came: for the Ophir of Gen. x. 29 he follows (p. 293) the view adopted by Glaser (below, p. 131 n. 4), upon grounds developed with much learning, but not cogent, that it was on the Arabian coast of the Persian Gulf; the Ophir of Solomon he finds (p. 341 f.) in Mashonaland between the Zambesi and the Sabi. There certainly were anciently very extensive gold-workings in Mashonaland, as Bent (*The Ruined Cities of Mashonaland*,

1892), and especially Hall and Neal (*The Ancient Ruins of Rhodesia*, 1902), have abundantly shewn. It is contended by Peters that the ruins of the great Zimbabwe (=‘House of Stone’) and other places in Rhodesia are of a character shewing that they were constructed by Phoenicians and Sabaeans (pp. 353 ff., 364; cf. Keane, *The Gold of Ophir*, pp. 160 ff., where the same view is maintained). Keane places even the Havilah of Gen. ii. 11 in Rhodesia, the Pishon being, seemingly, the Zambezi (p. 192); and supposes Tarshish to have been the seaport Sofala (20° S.). The grounds on which these positions rest require to be carefully tested: but as it is not affirmed by either of these writers that the Ophir of Genesis was in Mashonaland, a consideration of their arguments lies beyond the scope of the present commentary. The hypothesis of two Ophirs should clearly be only a last resort. In view of the connexion in which Ophir stands in Gen. x., ‘the burden of proof,’ as Mr Twisleton said long ago (OPHIR, in Smith, *DB.* ii. 1863, p. 640), ‘lies on anyone who denies Ophir to have been in Arabia’: at the same time difficulties undoubtedly arise, partly from the apparently Indian origin of the Heb. words referred to above, partly from the fact that Arabia does not seem to have been a country capable of producing gold in such quantities as Solomon (even allowing for some hyperbole) appears to have obtained from it (1 K. ix. 28; cf. x. 14 ff.). Hence the view that Ophir, though in Arabia, was an *emporium* for gold brought to it from elsewhere; though even so, as Palestine was a comparatively poor country, it is difficult to think what commodities Solomon would have had to offer in exchange for the gold obtained by him, and the inference has accordingly been drawn that the Israelites must have mined the gold themselves (Keane, p. 57 f.). This inference, if correct, would seem to imply that it was procured from some country other than Arabia. See further *EncB.* s.v.; Budge, *Hist. of Egypt*, ii. 132—4; Glaser, *Zwei Publikationen* [those of Keane and Peters] *über Ophir* (1902).

P. 138. It is conjectured by Prof. Sayce (*Exp. T.* Feb. 1907, p. 232 f.) that ‘Eber’ is from *ibira*, a ‘commercial traveller’ (from *ebēru*, to cross over), and denoted originally the trader who ‘crossed’ the Euphrates from its W. to its E. bank. The conjecture rests upon a slender basis: for *ibira* is apparently an extremely rare word, occurring only on two lexical tablets as a Sumerian gloss on the Ass. *damkaru*, ‘merchant.’ Deut. xxvi. 5 lends no support to the conjecture: for ‘wandering’ (RVm.) does not, as Prof. Sayce seems strangely to suppose, mean ‘travelling’ like an itinerant commercial agent, but ‘wandering’ like one who has lost his way, and is on the point of perishing (see 1 S. ix. 3, Ps. cxix. 116, Jer. l. 6, where the same word, lit. *perishing*, is used of a ‘lost’ animal).

P. 156 n. 4. Babylonian chronology for all the earlier period of the history is founded upon the tablet published first by Mr Pinches in 1884, containing a list (A), unfortunately mutilated in parts, of the kings from the First dynasty to the 7th cent. B.C.: by the side of each king’s name is given the number of years of his reign, and at the end of each dynasty the sum of the years of reign of all the kings of that dynasty. The kings of the First dynasty are all missing from this tablet; but they could happily be supplied

from another (B), which had been published by Mr Pinches, four years previously, in 1880, and which contained a list of the kings of the First and Second dynasties¹. These lists may be read most conveniently in *Records of the Past*, second series, vol. i. pp. 13—19; in *KB.* ii. 286—9; and, corrected and supplemented from other sources, in Gressmann, *Altorientalische Texte und Bilder zum AT.* (1909), i. 103—5; or Meyer's *Gesch. d. Altertums*², i. ii. (1909), on the chart opposite p. 334. The data contained even in list A do not enable us to determine directly the dates b.c. of the earlier Babylonian dynasties: but help is afforded in doing this by statements made by several of the later Bab. and Ass. kings of the intervals which had elapsed between certain of the earlier kings and themselves. Unfortunately, however, these statements are not all consistent with each other, and do not consequently lead to the same results. (See a synopsis of the statements, and a discussion of the problems to which they give rise, in Rogers' *Hist. of Bab. and Ass.* 1900, i. 312—348.) There is however a general agreement among Assyriologists that the Third, or Kasshite dynasty (see on Gen. x. 8), which is said in the list to have remained in power for 576 years, began about b.c. 1760 (Rogers, 1782). The First dynasty is said in the list to have lasted 311 years, and the Second 368 years; upon the assumption, therefore, which seemed to follow naturally from the manner in which the list was arranged, that these dynasties were consecutive, the First dynasty was generally supposed to have begun c. 2440 b.c. (Rogers, 2454). In 1907, however, Mr L. W. King³ published, from the tablets stored in the British Museum, a chronicle shewing that the Second dynasty did not follow the First, but was partly contemporary with both the First and the Third, Ilima-ilu, the first king of the Second dynasty, being a contemporary of Samsu-iluna and Abi-eshul, the 7th and 8th kings of the First dynasty, and Ea-gāmil, the last king of the Second dynasty, being contemporary with Bitiliash,—or, as the name is now read, Kashtiliash,—to all appearance the 3rd king of the Third dynasty. The discovery of this chronicle of course modified the dates which had commonly been assumed previously for the First dynasty, and with it the date of its 6th king, Hammurabi.

Here is a list of the kings of the first three Babylonian dynasties, with the dates assigned to them by Ungnad⁴, the scholar who, with Thureau-Dangin⁴, has been the latest to discuss them. The principal chronological statements made by various later kings are appended in footnotes: it will be seen that they do not all lead to consistent results:—

¹ The names, and lengths of reign, of the kings of the First dynasty are also now known independently from chronicles that have been discovered since.

² *Chronicles of Early Bab. Kings*, 1907, ii. 1 ff. See pp. 22—24.

³ *Orientalistische Litteratur-Zeitung*, 1908, p. 13 f. (cf. 1907, p. 638); and in Gressmann's *Texte u. Bilder* (1909), quoted above, i. 103 f. Thureau-Dangin differs from Ungnad only in giving for the Third dynasty b.c. 1761—1186 (so also Meyer) instead of b.c. 1757—1182.

⁴ *Journal des Savants*, 1908, pp. 190 ff. (with Table, p. 199); and in *Z. für Ass.* 1908, pp. 176 ff. (with Table, p. 186).

First Dynasty.

1. Sumu-abu (14¹), b.c. 2232—2219².
2. Sumu-la-el (36), 2218—2183.
3. Zabum (14), 2182—2169.
4. Abil-Sin (18), 2168—2151.
5. Sin-muballit (20), 2150—2131.
6. Hammurabi (43), 2130—2088³.
7. Samsu-iluna (38), 2087—2050.
8. Abi-eshu' (28), 2049—2022.
9. Ammi-ditâna (37), 2021—1985.
10. Ammi-zaduga (21), 1984—1964.
11. Samsu-ditâna (31), 1963—1933.
11 Kings. [300] years.

Third Dynasty

(The Kassites).

1. Gandash (16⁴), b.c. 1757—1742.
2. Agum I (22), 1741—1720.
3. Kashtiliash (22), 1719—1698.
4. Ushshi (8), 1697—1690.

Second Dynasty

(of the Country of the Sea, i.e. Lower Babylonia).

1. Ilima-ilu (60⁵), b.c. 2085—2026⁶.
2. Itti-ili-nibi (55), 2025—1971.
3. Damki-ilishu (36), 1970—1935.
4. Ishkibal (15), 1934—1920.
5. Shushshi (27), 1919—1893.
6. Gulkishar (55), 1892—1838⁷.
7. Peshgal-daramash (50), 1837—1788.
8. Adara-kalama (28), 1787—1760.
9. Ekur-ulanna (26), 1759—1734.
10. Melamma-kurkura (7), 1733—1727.
11. Ea-gâmil (9), 1726—1718⁸.
11 Kings. 368 years.

¹ The regnal years of the kings of this dynasty (as far as Ammi-ditâna) are supplied not from List B (the figures in which are inexact), but from a recently discovered Chronicle of the First dynasty, based upon two contemporary documents dating from the reign of Ammi-zaduga (see King, *Letters and Inscriptions of Hammurabi*, iii. (1900), pp. 213 ff., where the Chronicle is printed at length).

² Contemporary, according to Chronicle K (King, *Chronicles*, i. 14; Gressmann, i. 107), with 'Ilu-shumma, king of Assyria.' Now, Irishum, 'priest of Asshur,' and 'son of Ilu-shumma,' according to Shalmaneser I (c. 1300 b.c.), restored a temple 159 years before Shamshi-Adad, who did so again 580 years before Shalmaneser himself: according to Esarhaddon (b.c. 680—668), Irishum restored the temple 126 years before Shamshi-Adad, who did so again 404 years before Shalmaneser I (King, i. 121 f.). If, then, this Ilu-shumma—who is also elsewhere called 'patesi (priest-king) of Asshur' (*Mitteil. d. Orient-Gesellschaft*, Nos. 20, p. 28, 26, p. 54)—is the same as 'Ilu-shumma, king of Assyria,' the contemporary of Sumu-abu, the date of Sumu-abu will be, according to Shalmaneser I, c. 2100 b.c., and according to Esarhaddon, c. 1900 b.c.

³ Lived, according to Nabu-na'id (b.c. 559—539), 700 years before Burnaburiash (1399—1365 b.c. : see below, No. 19), i.e. c. 2100 b.c. See Rogers, i. 317.

⁴ The regnal years in this dynasty, as given in List A. The names and regnal years enclosed in square brackets are not preserved on the tablet, but are supplied from other sources (cf. Meyer, *op. cit.*, chart opposite to p. 334). See, for some differences in the dates and arrangement of Nos. 19—28, Langdon, *Exp. Times*, July, 1909, p. 456 f.

⁵ The regnal years in this dynasty, as given in List A.

⁶ Waged war with Samsu-iluna and Abi-eshu'. See the words of the Chronicle shewing this in King, ii. 20 f., or Gressmann, i. 107.

⁷ Reigned, according to a boundary-stone dated the 4th year of Bel-nâdin-apli (c. 1125 b.c.), 696 years before Nebuchadnezzar I (c. 1100 b.c.), i.e. c. 1850 b.c. See Rogers, i. 316.

⁸ An older contemporary of Kashtiliash, the Kassite. The words of the Chronicle are (King, ii. 22 f.; *Texte u. Bilder*, i. 107), 'Ea-gâmil, king of the Country of the Sea, [marched] against Elam. After him (i.e. after his death, Thureau-Dangin), the Kassite, Ulam-Buriash, brother of Kashtiliash, assembled his army, and conquered the Country of the Sea.'

5. Abi-rattash (-), 1689 [—1670].
6. Tazzigurmash (-), [1669—1650].
7. Agum II (-) [1649—1620].
- 8–15. [The names of 8 kings missing:
c. 1619—1430.]
16. [Karaindash, 1429—1415?]
17. [Kadashman-harbe, 1414—1405^{1.}]
18. [Kurigalzu I, 1404—1400.]
19. [Burnaburiash, 1399—1365^{2.}]
20. [Karahardash, 1364.]
- 21^{3.} [Nazibugash, 1363.]
22. [Kurigalzu II] (32?), 1362—1331.
23. [Nazimaruttash] (26), 1330—1305.
24. [Kadashman-Turgu] (17), 1304—
1288.
25. Kadash[man-harbe] (6?), 1287—
1282.
26. Kultur-Ellil (8?), 1281—1274.
27. Shagarakti-shuriash (13), 1273—
1261^{4.}.
28. Kashtiliash (8), 1260—1253.
29. Ellil-nádin-shumi (6 mo.), 1252.
30. Kadashman-harbe (6 mo.), 1251—
1250.
31. Rammân-shum-iddina (6), 1249—
1244.
32. Rammân-shum-usur (30), 1243—
1214.
33. Meli-shipak (15), 1213—1199.
34. Marduk-ablu-iddina (13), 1198—
1186.
35. Zamama-shum-iddina (1), 1185^{5.}
36. Bél-nádin[-ahí] (3), 1184—1182.
36 Kings. 576 years, 9 mo.

The Second dynasty, it is supposed, reigned in Babylon itself during the 176 years that intervened between the First and Third dynasties.

Poebel (*Z. für Ass.* 1908, pp. 162 ff.: see the Table, p. 175) agrees with

¹ In the Tel el-Amarna letters corresponds with Amenhôtep III (b.c. 1414—1383). Called *Kallimasin* by Petrie, and Winckler (*KB.* v. 1—13); Knudzon (*Die el-Amarna-Tafeln*, 1907, pp. 60 ff.) reads the name as it is given here.

² In the Tel el-Amarna letters corresponds with Amenhôtep IV (b.c. 1383—1365, Petrie).

³ Contract-tablets dated in the reigns of Nos. 21—28 exist (Meyer, *l.c.*).

⁴ Said by Nabu-na'id to have lived 800 years before himself, i.e. c. b.c. 1350 (Rogers, i. 318). This date is not consistent with the one given in the next note: Ungnad is guided by that date, Poebel by this (so also Radau and Langdon).

⁵ Waged war with Ashur-dân, king of Assyria. Ashur-dân reigned 60 years before Tiglath-Pileser I (Rogers, i. 326), who, Sennacherib says (Rogers, i. 320), reigned 418 years before himself (b.c. 705—681), i.e. c. 1110 b.c., so that Ashur-dân's date would be c. 1170 b.c.

Thureau-Dangin and Ugnad in the place which he assigns to the Second dynasty, relatively to the First and Third dynasties, i.e. he supposes the First and Third dynasties to be separated by the same interval; but, as he takes Nabu-na'id's 800 years for the interval between Shagarakti-shuriash and himself as exact, he places that king, and with him the whole Kasshite dynasty, 80 years earlier than Thureau-Dangin and Ugnad do, making it begin 1841 B.C., and assigning correspondingly higher dates to the First dynasty (B.C. 2300—2000), and to Hammurabi (B.C. 2198—2155).

King (i. 101—113) and Meyer (*Gesch. d. Altertums*², I. ii. (1909), pp. 339, 340—1; cf. the Table, p. 585), urging the facts that the kings of the Second dynasty are called not kings of Babylon, but kings of the 'Country of the Sea' (i.e. Lower Babylonia), and also that no inscriptions of the Second dynasty have been found in or near Babylon, eliminate the Second dynasty altogether from the succession of Babylonian dynasties, and make the Third dynasty follow immediately after the First. The date for the First dynasty, according to these scholars, is thus B.C. 2060—1761, and for Hammurabi, B.C. 1958—1916. This date, it is pointed out, agrees with that which would follow for Sumu-abu (c. 2100) from the statements of Shalmaneser I (p. XXIX n.). As Ilima-ilu, the first king of the Second dynasty, synchronizes with Samsu-iluna, the Second dynasty will now begin c. 1910 B.C., and end (King) 368 years afterwards, i.e. c. 1542 B.C.: Kashtiliash, the contemporary of Ea-gāmil, is thus, according to King, not—as it seems natural to suppose—the third Kasshite king of that name, but an at present otherwise unknown king, who lived after the 7th Kasshite king, Agum II. Meyer, on the contrary, arguing that 368 years is an improbably long period for a dynasty of 11 kings, reduces it to 200 years: beginning c. 1910 B.C., it thus ends c. 1710 B.C.; and Kashtiliash, the contemporary of Ea-gāmil, is the third Kasshite king of that name. In making the Third dynasty continuous with the First, King thus abandons the synchronism of Ea-gāmil with Kashtiliash: Meyer retains this synchronism, but reduces all the reigns of the kings of the Second dynasty. Future discoveries may shew either,—or neither,—of these theories to be correct; but meanwhile the chronology of Thureau-Dangin and Ugnad seems to do better justice to the *data* we at present possess.

P. 156 n. 5. It is considered now that Kudur-mabuk had two sons; and that Arioche is to be identified not with Rīm-sin, but with his brother Arad-sin, 'Arioche' corresponding to *Eri-agu*, the Sumerian equivalent of Arad-sin. I quote from a letter received from Dr Stephen Langdon, Reader of Assyriology in the University of Oxford:—'The fact that Kudur-mabuk had two sons, *Eri-agu*, and *Rīm-agu*¹ or *Rīm-īlu Sin*, was discovered by Bezold some years ago, and established by Thureau-Dangin in his *Die Sumerischen u. Akkadischen Inschriften* (1907), p. 210, note ^k. *Arad-īlu Sin* is Semitic for the Sumerian *Eri-agu*. *Arad-īlu Sin* in Semitic means "Servant of Sin" (the Moon-God); and in Sumerian *Eri-agu* means "Man of the Crown"

¹ *agu* stands for *dīngiragu*, the Sumerian for 'God of the Crown' (*agu* meaning 'crown,' and being the Sumerian name of the Moon-God, and *dīngir* being the determinative of 'God'): it is thus the Sumerian equivalent of the Semitic *īlu Sin*, the 'Moon-God.' 'Rim-Sin' means the 'Wild-ox (RSN) of the Moon-God.'

(i.e. of the Moon-God); the two names are thus equivalent in meaning to each other; and *Eri-dagu* is just the Sumerian name of Arad-*ilu*Sin, the elder son of Kudur-mabuk. The Elamite *mabuk* seems to replace *lagomar* in the equation *Kudur-mabuk=Kudur-lagomar*. It appears to me that Kudur-mabuk of the Larsa inscriptions (mostly Sumerian) is identical with the Biblical *Kudur-lagomar* ("Chedorla'omer").

The inscriptions which were formerly all regarded as relating to Rîm-sin are now referred partly to Arad-sin, and partly to Rîm-sin. See Thureau-Dangin, *op. cit.* pp. 211—221 (where six inscriptions of Arad-sin are translated, and six of Rîm-sin¹); and, for the history, Ed. Meyer, *Gesch. des Altertums*², I. ii. (1909), pp. 550—556.

Here are two of the inscriptions, as translated by Thureau-Dangin:—

(Brick A, from Muḳayyar=Ur.) ‘To Nannar, his king, Kudur-mabuk, *adda* of the land of Martu, son of Simti-shilḥak, when Nannar had received his prayer, built the ...?... of Nannar, for his own life, and for the life of Arad-sin, his son, king of Larsa.’

(Brick B, also from Muḳayyar.) ‘Arad-sin, the mighty man, whom as a righteous shepherd (king) En-lil (Bel) has appointed, who cares for Ur, king of Larsa, king of Shumer and Akkad—son of Kudur-mabuk, the *adda* of Yamutbal, am I. That I might enlarge Ur, and have an exalted name, have I humbly prayed; Nannar, my king, has heard me: a great wall, which, like a lofty mountain, cannot be undermined, which shines like the glow of terror, have I built him. May his city be firmly established! This wall, “Nannar makes sure the soil of the land” is its name.’

In a third inscription Arad-sin speaks of himself as one who fulfils the decisions of Eridu, restores Lagash and Girsu², and renovates the city and the land; and says that when the God of the new moon had let him behold his favourable sign, and commanded him to rebuild and restore his temple, he had built the temple in which the god delighted, for his own life, and for the life of Kudur-mabuk, his father and begetter.

It seems that Kudur-mabuk appointed first his son Arad-sin king in Larsa, and after Arad-sin's death his other son Rîm-sin³. Both speak of the various temples which they had built. Arad-sin states that he has enlarged Ur, and surrounded it with a strong wall, and restored Lagash, and boasts that he has been appointed a ‘righteous shepherd’ of the god Ellil of Nippur, and that he executes the decisions of Eridu (i.e. of the god Ea, whose temple was in Eridu: below, p. 52). Rîm-sin seems to have extended the kingdom of Arad-sin. He not only calls himself ‘shepherd of the whole land of Nippur,’ and boasts of his care for Eridu, Ur, Larsa, and Lagash, but also says that Anu, Ellil, Ea, and all the great gods have given Uruk (Erech) into his

¹ These translations supersede the more tentative and incomplete translations of seven of these inscriptions given in 1892 by Winckler in *KB.* iii. 1, pp. 93—99.

² The *tēμeρος* of the Temple of Lagash (Meyer, p. 553).

³ ‘Arad-sin in all his inscriptions mentions his father Kudur-mabuk as still alive. Rîm-sin names him twice only: in his other inscriptions, in which he does not mention him, his own name has the divine determinative; probably, therefore, Arad-sin died before his father; Rîm-sin succeeded him, and after his father's death assumed divine honours’ (Thureau-Dangin, p. 210 n.⁴).

hands, and that he has built a temple there. He also mentions other successes.

It will be interesting if Dr Langdon's identification of Chedorla'omer with Kudur-mabuk should be confirmed. It is remarked by Mr Ball (*Exp. Times*, Oct. 1907, p. 41) that the name of the deity *Lagamal* (no doubt, the same as *Lagamar*) occurs in a number of proper names on some tablets of the First dynasty, recently acquired by St John's College, Oxford.

P. 157 n. 3. The uncertainty of the reading arises from the 'polyphony' of the cuneiform script, i.e. from the remarkable, but well-established fact that the same character may denote different sounds¹. In the three inscriptions referred to, the name which has been supposed to correspond to Chedorla'omer is written in characters which, read phonetically, would give

- (1) KU-KU-KU-MAL
- (2) KU-KU-KU-MAL
- (3) KU-KU-KU-KU-.....

The last character in (3) is obliterated. Mr King, having stated these facts, continues, 'The three names are said to be identical, and to be a fanciful way of writing Chedorla'omer. Assuming that (3) is to be restored from (2), which is by no means certain, we get two forms of the name, one beginning with KU written three times, the other with it written four times. As the character has also the value *dur*, and *Kudur* is a well-known component of Elamite names, the second occurrence in each name is probably to be transliterated *dur*, so that the names can be reduced to *Ku-dur-ku-mal*, and *Ku-dur-ku-ku-mal*. In order to get the names more like that of Chedorla'omer, it was suggested by Mr Pinches that the character in question had on its third occurrence the value *lah* or *lag*, and the names were transliterated by him as *Ku-dur-lag-mal* and *Ku-dur-lag-gu-mal*, the former being described by him as "defectively written." But there is little justification for assigning the new value *lah* or *lag* to the character used; and, though *Ku-dur-ku-ku-mal* is styled a king of Elam, there is no reason for supposing him a contemporary of Hammurabi. He might have occupied the throne at any period before the 4th century B.C. Although however Chedorla'omer's name has not yet been identified in any Babylonian inscription, there is no reason at all why it should not be found in one.' Mr King then proceeds to point out (cf. below, p. 157 f.) 'that Chedorla'omer is in form a purely Elamite name, *Kudur-Lagamar*, and that a joint expedition, such as that described in Gen. xiv., might have taken place, consistently with what we know of the politics of the age, in the early part of Hammurabi's reign. Thus it would not be surprising if the name Chedorla'omer should be found as that of a king of Elam in an inscription of the Old Babylonian period. Up to the present time, however, no such discovery has been made.' Comp. Johns in the *Expositor*, Oct. 1903, pp. 282—7, who after a discussion of the names of all the four kings from the East concludes (p. 286), 'The cuneiform originals suggested for the names in Gen. xiv. are therefore only ingenious conjectures. They may all be right, but as yet not one is proved.'

¹ See Evett's *New Light on the Bible* (1892), pp. 119 ff., 452—4.

P. 172 f. Prof. Sayce has reverted to the subject of Gen. xiv. in the *Exp. Times* for Aug. 1906, pp. 498 ff.; but his article contains nothing which renders it necessary for me to modify anything that I have written upon it. The names of Chedorla'omer's allies being, no doubt, Babylonian, they would naturally be derived through some channel or other from a Babylonian source; but no evidence has at present been adduced sufficient to shew that they were derived directly from a cuneiform document of Hammurabi's age, still less that the Heb. text of Gen. xiv. is a translation, or paraphrase, of a cuneiform original. Prof. Sayce's conclusions simply do not follow from the premises, or *data*, which he uses.

P. 173. It is stated by Prof. Sayce expressly, and by Dr Orr¹, and Prof. A. T. Clay², by implication, that Nöldeke's arguments against the historical character of the narrative of Gen. xiv. have been refuted by archaeology. The statement supplies such an object-lesson of the methods on which the opponents of criticism not unfrequently rely, that it may be worth while to explain here the grounds upon which it rests. Here are Prof. Sayce's words (*Monumental Facts*, 1904, p. 54; cf., though without Nöldeke's name, *Monuments*, p. 161 f.):— 'In 1869 the great Semitic scholar, Professor Nöldeke, published a treatise on the "Unhistorical character of Gen. xiv." He declared that "criticism" had for ever disproved its claim to be historical. The political situation presupposed by it was incredible and impossible; at so distant a date Babylonian armies could not have marched to Canaan, much less could Canaan have been a subject province of Babylonia. The whole story, in fact, was a fiction based upon the Assyrian conquest of Palestine in later days. The names of the princes commemorated in it were etymological inventions: eminent Semitic scholars had already explained those of Chedorlaomer and his allies from Sanskrit, and those of the Canaanitish princes were derived from the events in which they were supposed to have borne a part.' And then he goes on to declare triumphantly (p. 55) how the progress of archaeology has refuted all these statements.

It will probably surprise the reader to be told that, of the series of arguments thus attributed to Prof. Nöldeke, while the one about the names is attributed to him with *partial* correctness (though in so far as it is stated correctly, it has not been refuted by archaeology), the other arguments were *never used by him at all!* Prof. Nöldeke, in the articles referred to, does not say a single word about the political situation presupposed in Gen. xiv. being incredible and impossible, or about the impossibility of Babylonian armies at such a distant date marching to Canaan, or of Canaan being subject to Babylonia. On the contrary, what he does say is this³: 'Chedorlaomer, king of Elam, appears clearly in vv. 5, 9, 17, as the over-lord of the others (the "Oberkönig"). The fact that we know nothing about such a widely-extended hegemony of the people of Elam'⁴ is no reason whatever for rejecting this

¹ *Problem of the Old Testament*, p. 411.

² *Light on the OT. from Babel* (Philadelphia, 1907), pp. 125—7.

³ *Untersuchungen zur Kritik des AT.s* (1869), p. 159 f.

⁴ Prof. Sayce writes 'Babylonia': but this is quite beside the mark; the narrative itself gives Elam, not Babylonia, the political supremacy.

statement; we know far too little of the ancient history of Western Asia to do that.' So far from denying the wide dominion of the Eastern power, Prof. Nöldeke thus expressly declares that there are no reasons for questioning it! After commenting on the perverseness of following Josephus in substituting 'Assyrians' for the 'too obscure Elamites,' he goes on to say, 'What Ellasar was we do not know; but naturally our ignorance of the kingdom can form no argument against the correctness of the narrative.' And in a footnote he expressly rejects the explanation of Amraphel from Sanskrit (he mentions no such explanation of any of the other names), on the ground that Indian names are not likely to have been current in Babylonia. The idea that the narrative is a fiction based upon Sennacherib's expedition against Judah is mentioned by him (p. 172); but, in spite of Prof. Sayce's statement to the contrary, only to be rejected! The one grain of truth in Prof. Sayce's long indictment is that of the names of the five *Canaanite* kings, which are given, Bera' and Birsha' (suggesting the idea of 'evil' and 'wickedness'), and perhaps Shin'ab and Shem'ever as well, are formed artificially; but this (N.B.) is *not asserted* of the name of any of the four kings from the East.

The fact is, Nöldeke's arguments on Gen. xiv. have not been refuted, or even touched, by archaeology. In all that he said about the four kings from the East, the hegemony of Elam, the historical possibility of a kingdom of Ellasar, &c., he expressed himself, though writing forty years ago, with such sound historical insight that, while he left room for all the then unexpected discoveries which have since thrown such a flood of light upon the further East, not one of these discoveries has affected the truth of what he said. The historicity of some at least of the four kings from the East has been made probable by archaeology: but that Nöldeke did not deny. The wide-extended rule and influence of Babylonia in ancient times has been proved by archaeology; but that also Nöldeke did not deny. He did question the historicity of the five kings of Canaan; but this has not been proved by archaeology. Prof. Sayce has simply not mentioned Nöldeke's real arguments at all. Nor are they mentioned by Dr Orr or Professor Clay. Nöldeke's real arguments¹ are all based, not upon the impossibility of Babylonia at such a time ruling or sending expeditions as far as Canaan, or upon the other premises imaginatively ascribed to him by his critics, but upon the *internal improbabilities* of the route, and certain other details, of the expedition itself (of the kind indicated below, p. 171f.). These arguments are forcible, and difficult to meet except by the concession that the details criticized are not reported with literal exactness; certainly archaeology has as yet done nothing to meet them. Archaeology has met the arguments which Nöldeke did *not* use: it has not met the arguments which he *did* use. Nöldeke never questioned, as Prof. Sayce declares that he did, the *general* possibility at this time of an expedition being sent from the far East into Palestine: his argument consisted in pointing out various historical improbabilities attaching to the details of a *particular* expedition; and archaeology can overthrow this argument only by producing evidence that this expedition, *with the details as stated in*

¹ *Ibid.* pp. 160—172.

Gen. xiv., actually took place. And this up to the present time (June, 1909) archaeology has not done.

Dr Orr (pp. 411—413, 531 f.) expresses himself very confidently that the narrative of Gen. xiv. is not a 'Midrash.' The present writer has not maintained that it is. But in spite of the archaeological facts which Dr Orr has amassed in support of his position, a historian as conversant with antiquity as Ed. Meyer, writing in 1909, has no hesitation in giving it that character (*Gesch. d. Alt.*², I. ii. 551 f.). It may be inferred that the argument founded by Dr Orr upon the facts is not as cogent as he would desire it to be.

P. 180. It has been argued lately that the patriarchs 'lived under the law of Hammurabi'¹, and moreover that the laws implied in the narratives of Genesis are those actually current in the patriarchal age, and such as no post-Mosaic writer could have imagined or invented. Supposing this conclusion to be sound, it would not be inconsistent with the position taken in the present volume, in which it is maintained that the patriarchal narratives contain a genuine historical nucleus (pp. lvii, lviii, 143). The conclusion is, however, a very doubtful one. The resemblances appealed to are not sufficiently *distinctive* to prove what is alleged. Most of the parallels that have been adduced are too slight to merit any attention (e.g. Hammurabi's code, § 108 and Gen. xlvi. 16, § 117 and xlvi. 19, § 185 and xv. 3: the law, also, of § 8, prescribing death as the penalty for theft from a temple or palace, is surely not needed to explain the words either of Laban in xxxi. 32, or of Joseph's brethren in xliv. 9). What at first sight appears to be a stronger case is supplied by § 146, which prescribes that if a man's wife² has given him a concubine, and the concubine afterwards bears children, and makes herself equal with her mistress, because she has borne children her mistress may not sell her, she may reduce her to bondage (lit. put fetters upon her), and count her among her women-slaves: she may only be sold (§ 147) if she has not borne children. Comp. Gen. xvi. 2, 6, where Sarah gives Abraham a concubine, Hagar, who, when she finds that she has conceived, is arrogant towards her mistress, who then 'deals hardly' with her (also xxx. 3, where Rachel gives Laban a concubine). The action of Rachel, and even that of Sarah, can, however, be quite naturally explained without calling in Hammurabi's law. The custom of having concubine-slaves, —to say nothing of other countries,—was, and still is, common in the Semitic East; it is implied for Israel in the law of Ex. xxi. 7—9; and it prevails among the Arabs to the present day. A custom so widely diffused as this, and attested for Israel itself by Ex. xxi., obviously does not require the code of Hammurabi to explain it. Even moreover though it were true that Sarah could not sell Hagar, the operation of Hammurabi's law would not be neces-

¹ See, on Hammurabi, p. 156 n. 4, with the references.

² 'If a man has married a wife,' &c. So Peiser, Harper, and others. Mr Johns, however, in §§ 144—7 renders 'a votary' for 'a wife,' and adheres to that rendering: the sign used, he tells me, never has the value of *aššatu*, 'a wife,' and can only be so read upon the assumption of an error on the part of the engraver. In its actual wording, therefore, Hammurabi's law will apply not to wives in general, but only to married 'votaries'; though it is possible, as Mr Johns suggests, that its intention is to extend to married votaries a provision already in force for other married women.

sarily presupposed. In Mohammedan countries, a concubine-slave who has borne children to her master is entitled to her freedom, if not immediately, yet at her master's death: if he has not already the four wives allowed by Mohammedan law, he generally marries her; if he does not do this, though he may continue to employ her as a slave, he cannot sell her; at least, if he does so, it is accounted a disgrace to him¹. The feeling against selling a concubine-slave who has given her master a child is thus not *peculiar* to Hammurabi's code; and the argument that would prove the patriarchs to have lived under Hammurabi's law would prove Mohammedans to live under it likewise. Probably indeed both Hammurabi and Mohammed merely codified an already existing Semitic custom. There is nothing however in Gen. xvi. which implies that Sarah could not sell Hagar. Sarah naturally resented her slave-girl's behaviour, and took measures of her own to reduce her to submission, so that she fled: there is nothing to suggest that she desired to sell her, so that we are not entitled to say that she acted as she did, because the law did not allow her to sell her: in fact, the words (xvi. 6) 'do to her that which is good in thine eyes,' imply that she was at liberty even, if she pleased, to sell her. In no case, therefore, is the hypothesis that the patriarchs lived under the law of Hammurabi required for an explanation of the facts.

P. 180 n. 1. On the supposed N. Arabian 'land of Mušri,' of which Winckler and others have recently made so much, see now also the criticism of Ed. Meyer, *Die Israeliten und ihre Nachbarstämme* (1906), pp. 455 ff.

P. 225. Prof. Sayce (*Exp. T.* June, 1907, p. 419) says that נֶשֶׁא אֱלֹהִים is a literal translation of the Babylonian *ishshak ilāni*, 'viceroy of the deified king,' *patesi* or *ishshak* being a title borne by the governors of Babylonian provinces and subject-cities down to the end of the Hammurabi dynasty. It would be interesting, if true, to find that Abraham held an official position under Hammurabi, as governor of a province or city: at the time of Sarah's death he had, according to the chronology of Genesis (see p. xxvi), lived in or near Palestine for 52 years; and it would be still more interesting if we could discover in what part of the country his official residence was. But it must not be forgotten that נֶשֶׁא אֱלֹהִים is also perfectly good Hebrew for 'prince of God': so Prof. Sayce's explanation is in no case necessary.

With regard to the rest of this article, it must be remembered that the various words, or expressions, occurring in Gen. xxiii., stated in it to be similar to, or borrowed from, those current in Babylonia, are also one and all perfectly good Hebrew; and hence their occurrence in this chapter is no evidence that it was based (*ib.* p. 421 f.) upon early Babylonian documents. This is shewn

¹ Cf. Burckhardt, *Arabia*, i. 341, 342 (in Mecca); Snouck-Hurgronje, *Mekka*, ii. 134 f.; Hughes, *Dict. of Islam*, pp. 59, 597; Kohler, *Rechtsvergleichende Studien*, p. 15 f. (cited by S. A. Cook, *The Laws of Moses and the Code of Hammurabi*, p. 168). See also the quotation from Lane in the note on Gen. xvi. 1 (where, like Sarah, the wife herself gives the husband his concubine).

The contract-tablet from the 12th year of Hammurabi, translated by Pinches (*OT. in the light, &c.* p. 185), though not bearing directly upon Gen. xvi., is of interest, as illustrating at least what might happen in Babylonia: a husband and wife jointly buy a daughter from her father, to be the wife's slave, and the husband's concubine; if she disowns her mistress, she may be sold.

below (p. 230) with regard to several of the expressions used; and it could be shewn with equal readiness of the others. Thus *késeph mālē*, 'full price (lit. *full silver*)', may correspond to the Bab. *kaspu gamirtu*, 'full price'; but 1 Ch. xxi. 22, 24 are evidence that the expression is likewise good Hebrew, and also that it could be used in Hebrew as late as the time of the Chronicler, c. 300 B.C. The endeavour to shew that the Heb. text of vv. 17, 18 is a translation of a Babylonian sale of land in the form in which it was drawn up in the age of Hammurabi is anything but convincing: no parallel at all resembling it is quoted; and Pinches (*OT. in the light*, &c. p. 238), after quoting two examples of contracts for the sale of land belonging to that age, which he says are 'types of hundreds of others known to Assyriologists,' remarks that they shew 'noteworthy differences' from the transaction recorded in Gen. xxiii.

P. 239 n. 2. Dr Orr (p. 107 n. 5) says that Wellhausen conjectures 'quite arbitrarily' *father* for *mother* in xxiv. 67. But if there are grounds for a conjecture, even though they may be insufficient to make it a certainty, the conjecture cannot justly be stigmatized as 'arbitrary.' Or does Dr Orr think that the syntax of *הָאֲהֻלָה שֶׁרֶה אָמוֹן* in v. 67 is so ordinary and normal as to arouse no suspicion that 'of Sarah his mother' is a gloss? And how comes it that, whereas throughout the chapter down to v. 56 the servant's 'master' has been Abraham, in v. 65 it suddenly becomes Isaac? The conjecture that a notice of Abraham's death once stood after v. 62 would at once explain this change in the person denoted by 'master'; and if, as the syntax strongly suggests, 'of Sarah his mother' should disappear from v. 67, then *his father* (אָבִיו) would naturally be read for *his mother* (אָמוֹן) in v. 67.

P. 262. Dr Orr (pp. 105 n., 493 f.) makes very light of the chronological difficulty discussed in the note on this page: the objection, he says, 'is an old one, and has frequently been replied to.' No doubt it has been: but it is necessary sometimes to consider the value of a 'reply.' Dr Orr implies that if Isaac, at the blessing of Jacob and Esau (Gen. xxvii.) were, as 'ordinarily assumed and as the remaining data combine to shew, 139 years old,' the difficulty would disappear. Let us grant, provisionally, this premise, and see how it works. Esau, we are told (xxvi. 34 f., P), was 40 years old when he married his two Hittite wives, who were a 'grief of mind' to his father and mother: as Isaac was 60 at the birth of Esau and Jacob (xxv. 26 f., P), he would, at the time of Esau's marriage, be 100. Is it, now, credible, or in accordance with human nature, that a parent, apprehensive (xxvii. 46, cf. xxvi. 35) lest his son, aged 40, should imitate his brother in making an undesirable match, would wait *thirty-nine years*, till he was 79, before taking steps to prevent it (see xxviii. 1, 2, 6, P)? That is what Dr Orr's explanation credits Isaac and Rebekah with having done.

P. 325. Dr Orr (p. 237 n.) finds nothing but 'misplaced ingenuity' in the supposition that two discrepant narratives are woven together in chap. xxxvii. Not to repeat what is said in the note about 'Midianites' (not '*the* Midianites') on xxxvii. 28, it is strange that he sees nothing surprising in its being said by (*ex hyp.*) one and the same writer that Joseph was *sold to* Potiphar by 'Midianites' in xxxvii. 36, and *bought by* Potiphar from 'Ishmaelites' in

xxxix. 1! It is also remarkable that in the text of the same page he seems to think it quite possible that the 'narrator of the life of Joseph' may have found the merchants to whom Joseph was sold described 'in one of his sources as Ishmaelites and in another as Midianites'! But how does this supposition differ in principle from the 'critical' theory which he thinks so baseless? It is simply the same theory in other words.

P. 344, on 'Abrek.' Spiegelberg (*Aegypt. Randglossen zum AT*, 1904, pp. 15 ff.) objects to the explanation of Brugsch and Renouf that 'thy command is our desire' is neither an Egyptian expression, nor suitable in the mouth of a herald; and explains 'Abrek' as an Egyptian word meaning 'Give heed!' 'Attention!'

P. 365 n. Dr Orr (p. 366 f.) again tries to persuade his readers that the chronological discrepancy pointed out in the note is imaginary, and that there is really no difficulty in the chapter whatever. The difficulty caused by the inclusion of Hezron and Hamul disappears, he thinks, entirely upon the 'ordinary solution' that they are introduced as the 'legal representatives and substitutes of Er and Onan, who are said to have died in the land of Canaan.' But in the first place this supposition is artificial and arbitrary in the extreme: Perez represented Er alone, not Er and Onan (notice the terms of xxxviii. 8); and secondly, even allowing, for the sake of argument, that Hezron and Hamul did represent Er and Onan, nothing is gained: the list, as it stands, —and Dr Orr will have nothing to do with it in any other form,—expressly purports to be, not a list of Jacob's descendants as such, but (vv. 8, 26) a list of Jacob's descendants who *came into Egypt*: Hezron and Hamul, therefore, even though they appear as the representatives of Er and Onan, can only be included in it because they came into Egypt. The chronological difficulty (explained in the footnote on p. 365) thus remains exactly as before.

It is impossible to discuss the whole question again; but the principal inconsistencies may be briefly placed again before the reader. (1) The list purports to be one of the 'children of Jacob' (v. 8), or of the 'souls belonging to Jacob that *came out of his loins*' (v. 26), who 'came into Egypt': Jacob, therefore, ought to be excluded: but in v. 8 his name is included. (2) The 'sons and daughters' of Leah are said in v. 15 to be 33: if the actual names in vv. 8—15 are counted, there will be found to be 34, or,—excluding Er and Onan, who are said to have died in Canaan, and who consequently cannot have come into Egypt,—32. (3) In vv. 19—22 Manasseh and Ephraim are included among the 14 sons of Rachel, who, with the 33 of v. 15, the 16 of v. 18, and the 7 of v. 25, make up the 70, who (Ex. i. 5, as well as v. 27 end here) came down with Jacob into Egypt; in v. 27^a they are plainly excluded. (4) In v. 26, after the whole number of Jacob's descendants who came into Egypt is said to have been $33 + 16 + 14 + 7$ (i.e. 70), it is suddenly said that they were 66; this figure being raised to 70 (v. 27) by the addition of Manasseh and Ephraim, and seemingly Joseph (who have all been mentioned before), and Jacob (inconsistently with v. 26^a). There are thus a series of distinct and separate inconsistencies in the list. Clearly, therefore, it presents some 'problem' which claims solution. Can a list containing so many inconsistencies be throughout the work of *one hand*? Must not corrections have been in-

roduced into it, which brought with them these inconsistencies? I have offered one solution. I do not say that it is the right one; and shall be only too happy to accept a better one, if it should be produced. But Dr Orr renders no help. He says that the omissions which I suggest ‘create difficulties and remove none.’ But they do remove *some* difficulties, as will be seen, if the list is read carefully with the omissions suggested. And they do not ‘create’ difficulties, though they leave some which are in the list already: for, in the list itself, the sum 33 in v. 15 can be harmonized with vv. 8—15 only at the cost of one of two inconsistencies: either Er and Onan must be included (though they were never in Egypt), and Dinah omitted as a later insertion (see on v. 15^a); or (Dr Orr’s alternative) Er and Onan must be excluded, and Jacob and Dinah included, which implies that the writer of the list reckoned Jacob as one of his own sons (see v. 15^b)! With what justice am I blamed by Dr Orr for accepting one of these inconsistencies, when he himself accepts the other? According to Dr Orr, the table ‘is evidently one of heads of families, and includes in its enumeration, not only Jacob himself and his daughter Dinah, but Er and Onan, who died in Canaan (represented by Hezron and Hamul), and Joseph’s two sons, who, though expressly mentioned as born in Egypt (v. 20), are embraced in “the souls that came with Jacob into Egypt.”’ But this view not only misreads the table, but removes no difficulty. The table is not a mere list of heads of families; it is a list of heads of families who *came into Egypt* (vv. 8, 26). I have indeed suggested myself that, in its original form, it was perhaps a list of Jacob’s descendants, as such, ‘drawn up without reference to the migration into Egypt, and afterwards not quite consistently adjusted to its present place’; but Dr Orr is not entitled so to understand the list, unless he excludes the clauses in vv. 8, 26, which speak of the migration into Egypt, as later additions (which he does not do). And the difficulties about Jacob being reckoned as one of his own sons, and Hezron and Hamul being (according to the chronology of JE) not even born at this time, remain as before, unremoved by his hypothesis.

P. 383, l. 16 f. *Kur*, to dig, is, however, an uncertain root (*Lex.* 468^b); and it would form not *m^ek̄hērāh*, but *m^ekhōrāh*. *M^ek̄hērāh* must come from *karar*, prob. to turn round; hence Dillm. suggests a curved knife, or sabre.

P. 392, on xlix. 24^d. In view of the names by which it has been supported the interpretation of this difficult clause obtained by vocalizing רַעַי for רַעֲי ought not perhaps to have been left unmentioned. Adopting this vocalization, Ewald (*Hist.* i. 409), Tuch, and Dillmann render the clause, ‘From there (where is) the Shepherd of the Stone of Israel,’ i.e. from heaven, whence the Shepherd-God [‘Shepherd’s God’ in Ewald, l. c. n. 2, is a mistranslation] (*Gen. xlvi.ii. 15, Ps. xxiii. 1, lxxx. 1*), revered at the sacred stone of Bethel (*ch. xxviii. 21*), stretches out His hands to support Joseph in the battle. The ‘Shepherd of the Stone of Israel,’ if this reading of the passage is correct, will thus be virtually a synonym of the ‘God of Bethel’ (*xxxi. 13*). Gunkel, combining this reading with that of the *Peshittā*, mentioned on p. 392, renders ‘By the name of the Shepherd of Israel’s Stone,’ understanding the expression to mean the Divine Shepherd, who was regarded (cf. below, pp. 267, 268) as dwelling in the sacred stone of Bethel. But Gunkel allows that the correct-

ness of the text is open to suspicion; and the ‘shepherd’ of a ‘stone’ certainly implies a strange combination of figures. Prof. G. F. Moore (*EncB.* iii. 2977, *n.* 14) proposes, ‘By the arm (or arms) of the Stone of Israel’ (משם רעה or מארע for מארע): this would form a good parallel to ‘hands’ in clause *c*; but would hardly be possible, unless the ‘Stone of Israel’ had come to be a mere title of Yahweh, the figure of the ‘stone’ being forgotten.

Various arguments and positions adopted in the present volume, in addition to those referred to above, are adversely criticised in Dr Orr’s *The Problem of the Old Testament* (1906): but I find no occasion to alter substantially anything that I have written in consequence. On particular points, as I have more than once remarked before, there is scope for difference of opinion, on account of the insufficiency or ambiguity of the *data*: but Dr Orr does not appear to me to have shaken any of the main conclusions reached by critics; and in his attempt to explain the facts of the OT. in accordance with what is virtually the traditional view, he has not shewn himself more successful than his predecessors. There is nothing substantially new in his volume: critics are quite familiar with the objections which he has marshalled against them; the present writer, at any rate,—and he cannot believe that he stands alone in this respect,—has examined and considered them again and again, and has always found himself brought to the same conclusion regarding them: they are *not* cogent, and they are far outweighed by the numerous and insuperable difficulties and inconsistencies attaching to the traditional view. Dr Orr does his best to explain away these difficulties and inconsistencies, and produces probably upon many readers the impression that he has done so: but those who have learnt not to rely upon confidently expressed assertions, but to examine passages and arguments for themselves, will, it is believed, soon discover how imperfect his explanations are. It is also to be remembered that divergence of opinion among critics does not necessarily shew, as Dr Orr seems often tacitly to argue, that there is no problem to solve, and that the traditional view may therefore be reinstated: it may equally be an indication that the problem is complicated, or the criteria ambiguous, and that more solutions of it than one are, with our present knowledge, possible or tenable. Except in the exact sciences, there is no branch of investigation in which, from the causes indicated, divergences of opinion among experts are not met with.

With regard to one point, the fault that Dr Orr finds with me (pp. 221, 238) for suggesting what is contrary to the fact in saying (below, p. xi) that the term Jehovah is ‘uniformly’ employed in Gen. xii. 10—20, whereas in fact it occurs there only once, I may say that my intention was to group together ch. xviii.—xix. (mentioned in the same sentence) and xii. 10—20, and to say that in both together (except in the verse, xix. 29, specified as excluded) the term was ‘uniformly’ employed (which is correct). In so far as the words ‘in the similar narrative’ before ‘xii. 10—20’ seem to suggest (what in writing the sentence I did not notice) that the two narratives were treated by me separately, I have not the least objection to omit them. The correction is a verbal one, and the general accuracy of the statement made is not affected by it.

NOTE ON THE CHRONOLOGY.

The Chronological Table on the next page is added for the convenience of readers. Alternative dates are in some cases given, in order that the reader may be aware of the amount of agreement and difference between different authorities. References to the principal authorities on which the Table is based, together with some explanation of the grounds for the differences, will be found in the notes in the *Addenda*; those for Egyptian chronology in the note on p. xxxiii.; and those for Babylonian chronology in the note on p. 156, n. 4 (add to those here mentioned Hilprecht, *The Babylonian Expedition of the University of Pennsylvania*, I. ii. (1896), pp. 24, 43). For the dates included in the Table, authorities earlier than those mentioned are mostly antiquated.

THE FIRST DYNASTY OF BABYLON¹.

	LIST OF KINGS.	CHRONICLE.	B.C. ²
Sumu-abu	15 years	14 years	2232—2219
Sumu-la-el	35 "	36 "	2218—2183
Zabum	14 "	14 "	2182—2169
Abil-Sin	18 "	18 "	2168—2151
Sin-muballit	30 "	20 "	2150—2131
Hammurabi	55 "	43 "	2130—2088
Samsu-iluna	35 "	38 "	2087—2050
Abi-eshu'	25 "	[? 2]8 "	2049—2022
Ammi-ditâna	25 "	37 "	2021—1985
Ammi-zaduga	22 "	10 [unfinished]	1984—1964
Samsu-ditana	31 "		1963—1933
	305 years		301 years

Assyria does not come into prominence during the period covered by the Table; the following dates may however be mentioned:—

	B.C.
Ushpia, priest of Asshur, builder of temple in the 'city of Asshur' (see on Gen. ii. 14) c. 2300
Ilu-shumma, the first king ³ of Assyria at present (1909) known c. 2225
Shalmaneser I, the builder of Calah (Gen. x. 10)	... c. 1300

The names of many early Assyrian *patesi's* (priest-kings) and kings have been recovered recently in the course of the excavations by the Germans of Kal'at Sherkât, the site of the 'city of Asshur.'

¹ From King's *Letters and Inscriptions of Hammurabi*, iii. (1900), p. lxx f. The first column gives the regnal years of the several kings according to the *List of Kings* (B) published by Mr Pinches in 1880 (above, p. XXVIII); the second gives their regnal years according to the recently discovered *Chronicle* of the First Dynasty, which is based upon two contemporary documents dating from the reign of Ammi-zaduga (above, p. XXIX, n. 1).

² According to Thureau-Dangin and Ungnad.

³ L. W. King, *Chronicles concerning Early Bab. Kings* (1907), i. 116, ii. 14. Elsewhere he is styled *patesi* (cf. p. XXIX, n. 2).

CHRONOLOGICAL TABLE.

First appearance of man
 Diffusion of mankind over the earth
 Gradual growth of racial distinctions
 Formation of principal families of languages
 Palaeolithic age
 Earlier part of Neolithic age, and development of civilization to the level reached when the earliest historical monuments appear in Babylonia and Egypt

} Not determinable in years B.C.; but must have extended over many millennia before c. B.C. 6000—5000

Babylonia	B.C.	Egypt		
		Remains of predynastic civilization in Egypt		
		Petrie *	Meyer	Breasted
Estimated date of foundation of Temple of Bel at Nippur (Hilprecht)	before 6000			
Many vases, inscriptions, &c. in the British Museum	c. 4500	Introduction of the Calendar	4241	4241
Lugal-zaggisi, king of Uruk (p. xxxii)	c. 4000	Menes, first king of Egypt mentioned by Manetho	4777	3315 c. 3400
Sargon of Agadè (pp. xxxii, 173 n.)	3800	Fourth dynasty	3928—3721	2840—2680 2900—2750
Many kings of Lagash, Ur, and Uruk	c. 2800	Cheops, builder of the Great Pyramid	3969—3908	2816—2093 2900—2877
First dynasty of Babylon (Ungnad) 2232—1933 (Poebel) 2300—2000 (Meyer) 2060—1761		Twelfth dynasty	2778—2565	2000—1788 2000—1788
Hammurabi (6th king of First dynasty) (Ungnad) 2130—2088 (Poebel) 2198—2155 (Meyer) 1958—1916		Rule of the Hyksos	2098—1587	c. 1680—1580 1680—1580
The Kassite dynasty (p. 120)	1761—1682	Eighteenth dynasty	1587—1327	1600—1350 1580—1350
Burnaburiash (corresponds with Amenhotep IV) (Ungnad) 1399—1365 (Meyer) 1382—1358		Thothmes III	1503—1449	1501—1447 1501—1447
Nazi-maruttash (p. 122)	(Ungnad) 1330—1305 (Meyer) 1334—1309	Amenhotep III	1414—1383	1415—1380 1411—1375
Nebuchadrezzar I	c. 1140	Amenhotep IV (Khunaten)	1383—1365	1375—1358 1375—1358
		Nineteenth dynasty	1328—1202	1350—1205 1350—1205
		Ramses II	1300—1234	c. 1310—1244 1292—1225
		Merenptah (probably the Pharaoh of the Exodus)	1234—1214	1225—1215
		Twenty-first dynasty	1181—1060	1200—1090
		Ramses III	1180—1148	c. 1200—1169 1198—1167

* The dates are those given in his *History*; but now (since 1906), for reasons explained in the *Addenda* (note on p. xxxii), Petrie dates Menes B.C. 5510, the fourth dynasty B.C. 4731—4454, and the twelfth dynasty B.C. 3459—3246. The subsequent dynasties remain substantially as they are dated here (the eighteenth, B.C. 1580—1322).

Cambridge:

PRINTED BY JOHN CLAY, M.A.

AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS.



University of California
SOUTHERN REGIONAL LIBRARY FACILITY
405 Hilgard Avenue, Los Angeles, CA 90024-1388
Return this material to the library
from which it was borrowed.

QL APR 15 1982

RSP

FFP

For